REPLY TO THE LORDS.

CHILDREN'S MEALS BILL FOR SCOTLAND.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RIGHTS.

WESTMINSTER, FRIDAY NIGHT.

Almost the only novelty in to-day's debate on the School Children's Meals Bill was the apology offered by a distinguished historian for his homely appearance and lack of wit, and the natural gloom of his temperament. "'To be a well-favoured man is the gift of fortune,'" quoted Sir Henry Craik, sadly; "'but to read and write comes by nature.' I have only what nature gave me." Yet Sir Henry, though of a severe and frowning aspect, is not at all ill-favoured. He looks like what Mr. Wilkie called him to-day—a high-and-dry doctrinaire, sorely troubled not only by the Socialistic tendencies of the age, but also by its proneness to verbal flippancy. "Not for me," he sighed, "those gifts of gay persiflage which illuminate even dark and gloomy subjects with the light of their dexterous humour." Members sighed in sympathy. "Then be tender to those who do not possess such gifts," pleaded Sir Henry, and members again expressed their sympathy, doubtless wondering at the same time why this lachrymose Scottish tragedian should be so covetous of the jester's motley. A further passage revealed the astonishing secret that Sir Henry might have been as witty as the wildest of them but for a rash vow made in early youth on reading Dean Swift's advice—"Do not essay to be witty in your discourses. I could give you several reasons for this, but probably one is sufficient. It is at least a million to one that you have it not." To the practical mind of the youthful student the odds seemed quite out of proportion to the value of the possible prize, and accordingly he prudently decided while still a boy to leave "the arts of gay rhetoric and exhilarating diction" to triflers like the Lord Advocate.

In a House full of Scottish members—for the object of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald's bill was to extend to Scotland the provisions of last year's English bill—this plausible explanation was received with much favour. All the other potential wits felt equally absolved from the task of trying to outshine Mr. Thomas Shaw. Thus Mr. Finlay, Mr. Duncan, and Mr. Munro-Ferguson, to name only a few of the orators of the day, disdained the arts of persiflage and applied their eloquence to a rivalry of argument based on statistics and attested facts. A wit himself, Swift proved an extinguisher of wit in others. Our disappointment was the greater since Mr. Wilkie, having had the good fortune to precede Sir Henry Craik, had felt free to give us an appetising taste of Scottish humour. A point made by the opponents of the bill was that all the witnesses from Scotland examined by last year's Committee gave evidence against its proposals. "Yes," retorted Mr. Wilkie, "but who were the witnesses? Not a single Labour representative was examined." "Why not?" interjected Sir Henry Craik. The burly Labour member looked down on the spare figure of the scholar, and, pointing to him, exclaimed, "And echo answers 'Why not?'" The proper answer, it appeared, should have been that only one class of witnesses was examined because the Committee *had no time to hear* the evidence of others. But, as Mr. Wilkie pertinently argued, it was absurd to suppose that children in Scotland were less in need of food than English children, or that the keen northern air was less provocative of hunger than our southern breezes. Besides, the bill was of a permissive character. "Those who don't want it needn't have it, and we shall only be too glad that they are able to do without it." Over the conclusion of Mr. Wilkie's robust and racy speech Sir Henry Craik shook a disapproving head. Its diction was shockingly poetical, and, to aggravate the offence, it culminated in a quotation from "Scotland's national bard" vaguely associating the provision of school meals with the conception of a united people standing, "a wall of fire, around our much-loved isle." Significantly enough, Sir Henry Craik had to come across the Border to find a seconder for his motion for the rejection of the bill. "I undertake the duty," said Mr. Cox, in his pleasant manner, "out of a neighbourly feeling for my fellow-citizens in Scotland. I wish to save Scotsmen from the misfortune of such a bill as that thrust on England last year." Ungrateful Scotland refused to thank Mr. Cox for his chivalry. Nay, he was even denied his title to speak as a Liberal, Dr. Macnamara declaring that the member for Preston stood almost alone on the Liberal side in opposing the bill. A useful fact brought out by the same Minister was that, so far from the movement for the provision of school meals being due to "the Collectivist wing of the Labour party," its pioneers in Parliament for the last six or seven years had been himself, Sir John Gorst, and Mr. Claude Hay, ably assisted by Sir Francis Powell. Sir Francis again raised his voice in support of the measure, and, to the dismay of Sir Henry Craik, so did Mr. Cochrane, the leader of the Scottish Unionists. Finally the bill obtained the blessing of the Government, Mr. Sinclair announcing that his own bill, to be introduced later, would not conflict with this measure, but would rather supplement it. Thereupon the motion for the rejection was negatived by 227 votes to 52, and the second reading afterwards adopted without a division.

A curious little episode occurred at the close of the debate, worthy of note as an illustration of the Unionist attitude towards unofficial legislation. On a motion to refer the bill to the Grand Committee on Law, Mr. Balfour rose in some alarm to point out that this course might lead to a definite legislative achievement. Was that, he asked, what the Government contemplated? Did they mean to make the bill their own? The Opposition shuddered at the thought. Forgetful of Dean Swift's advice, the agitated Sir Henry Craik pointed to the Labour members and with unconscious humour invited Ministers to ask their "masters" what they were to do. "They are using their powers," declared Sir A. Acland-Hood, his moustache bristling with moral indignation, "to adopt any number of illegitimate children." In other words, the Government were actually proposing to treat the legislative efforts of private members in a serious spirit. It seemed a strange pretext for a private member's grievance, but the Opposition insisted on a division on the point, and were, of course, soundly beaten. In the half-hour that remained of the sitting Mr. Walter Rea succeeded in obtaining a second reading for another useful little measure—a bill embodying some of the provisions for the medical inspection of school children and for vacation schools contained in last year's Education Bill. A motion, however, to refer this bill also to a Committee, coming as it did after the time available for opposed business, was successfully vetoed, and that by the sole dissenting voice of Sir F. Banbury.

MISSING RELATIVES WANTED.

Mr. John J. Dwyer, solicitor, of 2, State-street, Hartford, Conn., U.S.A., has asked the assistance of the Lord Mayor of Manchester in finding the relatives and heirs of Mary Gaudin, who under the maiden name of Mary Collins married Alfred Edward Gaudin, probably in Manchester, some time before 1868. In a former letter on the subject Mr. Dwyer gave Mrs. Gaudin's maiden name as Montford, and he wishes now to correct the mistake.

MR. M'KENNA AND HIS BILL.

A WARNING TO MANAGERS OF SCHOOLS.

Mr. M'Kenna, President of the Board of Education, was the chief speaker at a meeting held at Marlow last night under the auspices of the South Bucks Liberal Association. Earl Carrington, who had been announced as chairman, was unable to be present through an attack of influenza.

Mr. M'Kenna said that after a year of office at the Treasury he had passed from those Olympian heights to a low level of political and religious controversy.—(Laughter.) He was happy to say that, so far as he could judge, England was served by a most competent body of men at the Education Department. He said this because of a letter from Lord Stanley of Alderley in the "Times," one unfortunate paragraph of which seemed to imply that there were officials at the head of the Board of Education who used their position for the purpose of insinuating into the minds of their political chiefs ideas which were adverse to the pronounced intentions of the Government. He could assure Lord Stanley of Alderley that he was utterly mistaken in that view, and that the heads of the Education Department were loyal and sincere servants of the public, desirous of carrying out the policy of the Government. He had absolute confidence in their determination to serve the present Ministry as faithfully as they served the last.—(Cheers.) He was thankful to say there were some few aspects of education outside the area of controversy, and it had been his good fortune almost in the first weeks of taking office to bring almost to the final point of completion the wish of his predecessor, Mr. Birrell, and that they would now have in this country a technological institute of the very best kind. That very morning he received a letter from the Commissioners of the 1851 Exhibition, placing at their disposal land at South Kensington of immense value, and they had before them the possibility of establishing an institution which would be a genuine rival to the very best that Germany could offer.—(Cheers.) Another uncontroversial matter was the Medical Inspection Bill, and he took the opportunity of thanking opponents of the Government for the friendly reception assured to that measure.

"THE LITTLE CONTROVERSIAL BILL."

With regard to the little controversial bill before Parliament the obligation of maintaining denominational schools first imposed on the rates by the Act of 1902 was a rock of offence to thousands and tens of thousands of our fellow-citizens. Passive resisters, as they were called, rather than pay so much of the rate as went to meet the cost of giving denominational instruction, preferred to go to prison. That was the state of things he had to face. He had also to face the position in Wales, where passive resistance would have been practically universal had there been any occasion for it, and where the county councils, recognising this, had taken the bull by the horns and refused to raise any rate for the maintenance of voluntary schools. Was it unreasonable he should wish to deal with these facts? Mr. Birrell endeavoured to deal with them in a comprehensive bill, a bill framed on the most generous lines, going to the extreme limit of concessions to the denominationalists, but found it rejected by the House of Lords. What was he to do under the circumstances with his friends in prisons and Wales in revolt? It was no use introducing another Education Bill. Denominationalists would not have better terms, and, if they did not get better terms, was there any chance of the bill passing? To meet the emergency he had introduced a short and simple bill, which, though of course it was condemned by extremists on both sides, would, he believed, prove a palliative for the particular evil with which they were confronted. It was not offered as a settlement of the education question, but so far as it went it would enable the law relating to education to be administered in this country, and would provide, he believed, some satisfaction to the Nonconformist conscience.

A HINT TO WOULD-BE EVADERS.

There seemed some misapprehension as to the part of the bill fixing one-fifteenth of the salary of a teacher giving denominational instruction as the proportion to be paid by the managers. Some critics said that one-fifteenth was too small a fraction; others that the schools would be so arranged that only a few of the teachers would be used to give denominational instruction, and that consequently payment would be evaded. In regard to the first point it was not proposed that the managers should pay for religious teaching of the same kind as that given in the Council schools now. In a great many schools all over the country denominational instruction was only given on one or two mornings in the week, and on the other mornings Cowper-Temple teaching. Therefore, taking an average over the whole district, they would find the amount of denominational instruction given very much less than it was in some particular school which perhaps the objector had in his mind. The deduction was made for the whole area, not for individual schools only. They had also to take into consideration the fact that the teacher was paid for work in addition to that done during school hours. As to the religious instruction being so arranged that only one teacher in a large school gave it, he said frankly he should not mind if this were done. However, he should ask at the end of a year, and he hoped others would ask, "Why are not these teachers who do not give religious instruction appointed by the public authority?"—(Cheers.) The whole case made by the supporters of non-provided schools for the appointment of the teachers by the managers was that the teachers had got to give the special denominational instruction. If the teachers gave the denominational instruction, then the managers must pay for it. If the teachers did not give the instruction, then why should not the county councils appoint the teachers?—(Cheers.)

HALIFAX BY-ELECTION.

MR. WHITLEY AND SUFFRAGISTS.

(FROM A CORRESPONDENT.)

HALIFAX, FRIDAY.

To-night, at a meeting of the Halifax Liberal Four Hundred, Mr. Whitley was readopted as the candidate with great enthusiasm.

In his address, Mr. Whitley stated that he hoped, if re-elected, as the least member of His Majesty's Government, to be able to do a little to help on the great programme which the Government had in front of them. He trusted that they had in prospect another five years of steady progress in economy, social reform, and, above all, in land reform. In the King's Speech there was set out a list of measures which, if accomplished, would do a great deal to change the face of England. He did not intend to discuss the difficulties in the way, particularly the "other place," as they called it. What he did say was that it was the duty of the Government, in looking at each reform individually, to keep in comprehensive view the whole of the things which they had set out to accomplish, and, taking each in its place, to advance step by step in order that the whole might be accomplished. If returned unopposed he should consider it a kindly act of courtesy from the whole of his constituents. On the other hand, if any party wished to exercise their undoubted right to bring forward a candidate, he was ready to discuss all the political questions of the day.

The disclosure has been made to-day that the women suffragists of the town are awaiting instructions from the headquarters of the Women's Social and Political Union, and the local Committee had hoped to report at a meeting on Sunday upon an interview with Mr. Whitley. The women's local secretary, Mrs. Williams, said to-day that she had grave doubts whether the Union would allow Mr. Whitley a walk-over. Mr. Whitley has handed me his reply to the women's letter. In this he says: "I understand those for whom you speak have declared their intention, where there is a contest, of opposing the Liberal candidates, whether in favour of women's suffrage or not. I do not see that any good purpose would be served by my receiving a deputation." In a postscript Mr. Whitley adds that his opinion in favour of extending the suffrage to women householders remains unchanged.

The Conservative Executive have cabled Sir Savile Crossley, who is in India, and they will meet at noon to-day.

THE EDALJI INQUIRY.

COMMITTEE'S REFUSAL TO RETRY THE CASE.

The Home Office yesterday issued a communication regarding the Edalji case. The Home Office states that the Home Secretary invited Sir Robert Romer (the late Lord Justice), Sir Arthur Wilson (the late Indian law officer), and Mr. J. Lloyd Wharton to form a committee to inquire into and report upon the case of Mr. George Edalji. They consented to meet, and subsequently the following letter was received by the Home Secretary from Sir R. Romer:—

15th February, 1907.

Dear Mr. Gladstone,—When you first mentioned to me that you contemplated the appointment of a committee of three, with myself as chairman, to inquire into the Edalji case, and I intimated my willingness to assist you, I did not fully realise what the duties of the Committee would be or the difficulties in their way. After further consideration of the matter with you, and with Sir Arthur Wilson and Mr. Wharton, I find it impossible for me to act, for the following reasons:—

I had not fully recognised that anything more was contemplated than my assistance in advising you whether a free pardon should be granted to Mr. Edalji, having regard to materials in the possession of the Home Office upon which, in the ordinary course, the Home Secretary would come to a decision. That assistance I was quite willing to give. But on going into the matter more fully with you I see that something more is contemplated—namely, a general inquiry into the case, and, indeed, possibly a public investigation. Now it appears to me that if such an inquiry is embarked upon it ought, in order to be satisfactory, to be done according to the ordinary rules of procedure governing a criminal trial. In my view, an inquiry of the kind ought to be in public or not at all, and I am not willing to undertake it.

May I point out to you some of the difficulties in the way of it? Apart from the objection of a retrial of a criminal charge so long after the conviction without a jury, there is a question of evidence. Such a Committee as you were desirous of appointing would have no power to call witnesses or administer an oath. To make the inquiry effective witnesses ought to be properly examined and cross-examined. I think that the Committee ought not to take upon itself the duty of cross-examination, and if counsel be employed the question arises who would act as counsel for the prosecution, and by whom would he be instructed. It appears to be thought that the inquiry in the Beck case was analogous to the present, but in that case the innocence of the convict was assumed, and no question of a retrial for a criminal offence arose. At any rate, speaking for myself, I do not see my way to act, as it were, as judge and jury in trying the particular question of the guilt or innocence of Mr. Edalji, and that without any proper legal power of summoning witnesses.—I am, yours very faithfully,

(Signed) ROBERT ROMER.

P.S.—I may say that Sir Arthur Wilson and Mr. Wharton have seen this letter and authorise me to state that they entirely concur in it.

The Home Office adds that Sir Robert Romer and his colleagues intimated that they were prepared to examine the material in the possession of the Home Office and to give their advice on the case to the Home Secretary. In the circumstances the Home Secretary decided to accept this offer. Some delay was caused owing to the withdrawal of Sir Robert Romer on account of private matters that had unexpectedly arisen. Sir A. de Rutzen, Chief Magistrate of London, having consented to fill the vacancy thus created, the examination of the papers is now proceeding.

THE LENT RACES AT CAMBRIDGE.

(FROM OUR ROWING CORRESPONDENT.)

The racing of the Lent boats at Cambridge was again favoured yesterday with magnificent weather. The First Division started in the following order:—Jesus, First Trinity, Trinity Hall, Emmanuel, Caius, Lady Margaret, Pembroke, First Trinity II., Christ's, Sidney, Third Trinity, Clare, Corpus, King's, Lady Margaret II., Jesus II. There was an excellent race between First and Hall, and also between Emmanuel and Caius, Caius bumping Emmanuel a few yards from the finish. Clare caught Third at the Willows, and Lady Margaret ran on King's in the Post reach.

The Second Division started thus:—Caius II., Jesus II., St. Catharine's, Trinity Hall II., Emmanuel II., Pembroke II., First Trinity III., Queens', Selwyn, Lady Margaret III., Clare II., Pembroke III., Peterhouse, Magdalene, King's II., Selwyn II. Only two boats rowed over. Jesus II. caught Caius II., and so rowed in the First Division. Hall II. bumped Catharine's at the Willows, where also Queens' got First III. Lady Margaret III. quickly overhauled Selwyn, bumping them at the Post corner. Pembroke III. also caught Clare II. at the Post corner, somewhat obstructing Peterhouse, who were bumped there by Magdalene. Selwyn II. got King's II. at Ditton.

The Third Division started as follows:—Selwyn II., Caius III., Trinity Hall III., First Trinity IV., Emmanuel III., Pembroke IV., Downing, Pembroke V., Christ's II., First Trinity V., First Trinity VI., Christ's III., Jesus III., Queens' II., Clare III., Fitzwilliam Hall. Five bumps were made. First IV. caught Hall III. at the Willows after a good race. Downing bumped Pembroke IV. in the Post reach. Christ's II. chased Pembroke V. to Glasshouse, where it made the bump. Christ's III. got First VI. in the Gut, and Queens' II. overtook Jesus III. in the Long Reach.

Jesus will probably remain head of the river, and Hall will probably come down to Caius. The following boats have already made three bumps:—Caius, Jesus II., Queens', Lady Margaret III., Downing, Christ's II., Queens' II.

SPOTTED FEVER.

TWO CASES IN DERBYSHIRE.

Two cases of spotted fever have occurred at Riddings, one of the villages in the area of the Alfreton Urban Council, Derbyshire, a father and son being attacked by the disease. The patients have been isolated at home under the supervision of the Council's medical officer of health. At their meeting next week the Council will consider the advisability of making the disease a notifiable one. The only previous case in Derbyshire was reported at Pilsley, near Clay Cross, a fortnight ago.

A thirteen-year-old boy, Fred Reed, of Lambeth, has been admitted to a London hospital suffering from spotted fever.

There were four deaths in Glasgow from spotted fever yesterday. Since the outbreak of the disease there have been in Scotland 422 cases and 239 deaths.

One death and six additional cases of cerebro-spinal meningitis were notified at Belfast yesterday.

Another death from spotted fever, making a total of nine, has occurred in Dublin. Three cases are now in hospital.

The second case of suspected cerebro-spinal meningitis at Leicester has proved fatal, as did the first. Both patients were children. The doctors are still undecided as to whether the two cases were actually spotted fever, but every precaution is being taken.

M. Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu, son of the well-known French publicist of that name and candidate in a Parliamentary by-election at Montpellier, was fired upon on Thursday night in the streets of that town by a man with a revolver. He was wounded in the left forearm. The bullet has been extracted. An inquiry has been opened into the matter.

LIMITING ARMAMENTS.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S ARGUMENT.

A PLEA FOR CONFERENCE.

The first number of the "Nation," which is the transformed "Speaker" under Mr. Massingham's editorship, is published to-day. It contains an article by the Prime Minister on the Hague Conference and the limitation of armaments. The Prime Minister sets himself to answer those who have objected to the raising of the question of armaments at the Conference. He points out that it is the very subject for which the first Conference was convened, and he challenges objectors to show that any essential change of circumstances has arisen to make mischievous in 1907 a course that had general approval in 1898. The original Conference was convened in the hope that the Powers might arrive at an understanding calculated to afford some measure of relief from an excessive and ever-increasing burden. The hope was not fulfilled, nor was it to be expected that agreement on so delicate and complex a matter would be reached at the first attempt, but on the other hand Sir Henry has never heard it suggested that the discussion left behind it any injurious consequences. The article proceeds:—

It was desirable in 1898 to lighten the burden of armaments, but that consummation is not less desirable to-day, when the weight of the burden has been enormously increased. In 1898 it was already perceived that the endless multiplication of the engines of war was futile and self-defeating, and the years that have passed have only served to strengthen and intensify that impression. In regard to the struggle for sea power it was suspected that no limits could be set to the competition save by a process of economic exhaustion, since the natural checks imposed on military power by frontiers and considerations of population have no counterpart upon the seas; and again we find that the suspicion has grown to something like a certainty to-day. On the other hand I am aware of no special circumstances which would make the submission of this question to the Conference a matter of international misgiving. It would surprise me to hear it alleged that the interests of the Powers in any respect impose on them a divergence of standpoint so absolute and irreconcilable that the mere discussion of the limitation of armaments would be fraught with danger. Here again it seems to me that we do well to fortify ourselves from recent experience.

The Prime Minister goes on to say that he can find only one hypothesis upon which the question of armaments can be put down as inadmissible, namely that guarantees of peace, be they what they may, are to be treated as having no practical bearing on the scale and intensity of warlike preparations. That, he remarks, would be a lame and impotent conclusion. This is the close of the article:—

The sea power of this country implies no challenge to any single State or group of States. I am persuaded that throughout the world that power is recognised as non-aggressive and innocent of designs against the independence, the commercial freedom, and the legitimate development of other States, and that it is therefore a mistake to imagine that the naval Powers will be disposed to regard our position on the sea as a bar to any proposal for the arrest of armaments or to the calling of a temporary truce. The truth appears to me to lie in the opposite direction. Our known adhesion to those two dominant principles—the independence of nationalities and the freedom of trade—entitles us of itself to claim that if our fleets be invulnerable they carry with them no menace across the waters of the world, but a message of the most cordial good-will, based on a belief in the community of interests between the nations.

To next week's number of "The Nation" Mr. Winston Churchill will contribute an article entitled "A Smooth Way with the Lords."

COTTON TRADE WAGES.

WEAVERS SEEK AN ADVANCE.

The question of an advance in weavers' wages was the subject of discussion at a conference held in Manchester yesterday between the Executive of the Northern Counties Weavers' Amalgamation and representatives of the North and North-east Lancashire Cotton Spinners and Manufacturers' Association. Mr. Henry Higson presided. The operatives were represented by Mr. D. J. Shackleton, M.P., their president; Mr. J. Crose, secretary; Messrs. Pope (Hyde), Ogden (Heywood), Park (Preston), Melling (Bolton), Thomas (Burnley), Gouldsborough (Blackburn), Ward (Nelson), and Shaw (Colne).

The conference was private, and at the close it was stated that there was no official announcement to make beyond the fact that the conference was adjourned till March 19. It is understood that, though the operatives' representatives intend to bring forward at the adjourned conference matters other than the wages question, the request for an advance was the topic of discussion yesterday. The amount of the advance asked for was not made public. Figures and percentages will be discussed in more detail at the adjourned conference, by which time the various local associations of manufacturers in the area concerned with the operatives' demand will have reported their views on the subject. Nearly half a million looms and about 120,000 weavers will be affected by the conference's final decision.

The operatives base their claim to better pay mainly on the general prosperity of the cotton trade. They were granted advances of 5 per cent in 1905 and 2½ per cent in May last, but, it is contended, this improvement has been nullified by the poorness of the material used in the looms. The question of bad material is likely to be discussed fully when the conference resumes its sitting on the 19th. The employers' case is that by the recent granting of two advances the earnings of operatives have reached a level unknown before in the trade, and that though a brisk business has been done for many months past the prices of yarn and the narrow margin of profit at which orders are being booked to-day make further concessions on the wages list unwise if not impossible.

Apart from the application for an advance in wages, the only subject referred to at yesterday's conference was the reply of the employers to the operatives' request for an advance in coarse reeds on the universal list made a month ago. The request was refused in accordance with the decision of the several local associations of employers.

BASUTO MISSION SUCCESSFUL.

Reuter's Agency learns that the Basutos who came over to England to urge their rights to own land return to South Africa on March 9 quite satisfied with the result of their mission. The Imperial Government, in agreement with the South African authorities, have recognised that their claim is justified, and a measure giving effect to this opinion will doubtless be introduced at an early date. The members of the deputation, though they failed to see the King, as was their wish, are delighted with their visit to England.

It is announced at Copenhagen that Prince Hans, the King of Denmark's uncle, met with a somewhat serious accident while visiting the Palace yesterday. The Prince stumbled over a carpet, and fell so heavily that it is feared that he has broken a rib. He was immediately taken to his own Palace, and is now confined to bed.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL.

A DUEL WITH MR. F. E. SMITH AT OXFORD.

FROM OUR UNIVERSITY CORRESPONDENT.

OXFORD, FRIDAY NIGHT.

The duel between Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. F. E. Smith drew a crowded audience at the Union to-night. Among the visitors was the Bishop of Southwark, father of the President, and among the undergraduate speakers was Mr. W. G. C. Gladstone. Mr. Smith delivered a slashing speech, which Mr. Churchill described as employing and relying on the single instrument of scorn. Mr. Churchill's own speech, which was an excellent foil in manner and matter, effectually dealt with the topics of Chinese labour, the Nonconformist conscience, and the Milner resolution, which the previous speaker had selected for his purposes. His treatment of Chinese labour was specially impressive and effective. Mr. Churchill ended on a high note. His fine appeal for social reform made a great impression on the House. It was felt that he had changed the sentiment of the audience, but not their votes. The motion of censure was carried by 486 votes to 274.

Viscount Wolmer (University College) moved—"That in the opinion of this House the present Government is unworthy of the confidence of the country." Mr. A. H. Villiers (Magdalen) opposed the motion, which was supported by Mr. H. M. Steinhart (Christ Church). Mr. W. G. C. Gladstone (New College)) who last year attained his majority and succeeded to the Hawarden estates, spoke in opposition to the motion.

Mr. F. E. Smith, M.P. (Wadham), ex-president, criticising the Government, he expressed sympathy with Mr. Winston Churchill on the difficulties of his position with regard to Chinese labour. After the return of the Liberal party there were roughly 16,000 more coolies in the mines than there were at the time the late Government were in office. If there were anything immoral in it the present Government would not allow it—(cheers),—for all knew their high moral character.—(Laughter.) As to whether the Transvaal was in favour of it, the election speeches of the Dutch party in the Transvaal must have been a revelation, even to those who had little to learn in that respect.—(Cheers.)

Mr. Winston Churchill, M.P., who rose at ten o'clock to reply, charged his hon. friend Mr. Smith with having had only one weapon, and that the weapon of scorn, to support the motion. In the use of that implement he had used an expression which all must regret when he described the British soldiers as hirelings.—(Cheers.) Such a statement was not conducive to the interests of the service. Mr. Smith had brought forward very few subjects to illustrate his general theme.—(Laughter.) His hon. friend now asked that the Liberal Government should be dismissed from power principally upon three grounds—(1) on account of what he called the Milner resolution; (2) on the ground of the Nonconformist conscience; and (3) on the ground of the present position of Chinese labour. They were no doubt all very important subjects. Yet he did not think that a sober and patient student of political affairs would think, even if all those three matters were susceptible of no other representation than that of his friend, that they were in themselves sufficient grounds for reversing the decision of the country in January, 1906. It would be thought, from what had been said, that the resolution about Lord Milner was one of censure. Nothing of the sort.—(Oh, oh.) After all, he knew, as he drafted it.—(Laughter and cheers.) When his friend was talking of the action of this Government in connection with its distinguished officers he (Mr. Churchill) could not help recalling the treatment which had been meted out to Sir Redvers Buller, Lord Roberts, and Sir Antony MacDonnell. The second point to which his friend had directed his scorn was the Nonconformist conscience. It was very easy to sneer at people's consciences.—(Laughter.) It was not very easy to explain how they worked.—(Laughter.) He would be very sorry to have to explain how his own worked.—(Laughter.) His hon. friend was a lawyer, and he (Mr. Churchill) would be still more sorry to have to explain his conscience.—(Great laughter.) He observed that his hon. friend quoted with great approbation a statement made in the House by a distinguished man to the effect that the Liberal party were always in a minority in hell.—(Laughter.) He (Mr. Churchill) could not resist the conclusion that there was at any rate one constituency to which his hon. friend would have no hesitation in appealing on behalf of the Conservative party.—(Great laughter and cheers.)

CHINESE LABOUR.

On the third point, Mr. Churchill maintained that the introduction of Chinese labour in South Africa without consulting the colony itself and independently of the opinion of many supporters of the Conservative party in this country was a grave blow at that Imperial sentiment on which we must so largely depend in the future. That was not the whole of the case. There were human forces as well as national forces, and to accept men's labour and refuse their comradeship was a distinct derogation from all standards of life and society which in a Christian world we had for so many years been trying to lift up. Be sure evil would follow from it. At election times things were said which in cold blood and after calm and dispassionate consideration could not be justified or sustained. But when all allowance had been made for that, he said that upon the whole the instinct which guided the democracy of this country in expressing their indignation against the Chinese labour experiment was a true and sound interest, and the punishment which fell upon those responsible for its introduction was a punishment richly deserved, and he trusted that it would be long maintained. His hon. friend had asked why the present Government had not got rid of it. It was not in their power to get rid of the existing system, excepting in so far as they could carry the people of South Africa with them.—(Cheers.) For that reason they welcomed the coming together of the new Assembly, because it would give the first authoritative pronouncement of the opinion of South Africa upon the principle of Chinese labour as a permanent institution in that country. He had good confidence, though he did not prophesy, that the decision would show that the opinion expressed so strongly in this country was supported by the democracy in the Transvaal as well as by the masses of the people here at home. But whatever might be that decision it should be clearly understood that the Government would hold to its pledges in the matter. Although those pledges required time to carry them into effect they would be most steadfastly persisted in.

THE GOVERNMENT'S RECORD.

In conclusion Mr. Churchill contended that the resolution of that night was at least premature. Looking at the Government's majority and to the fact that only one straight by-election had gone against them, as well as to the fact that they had been in office only a year, the legislative record of the last session of Parliament was not one of which any Liberal party had reason to be ashamed.—(Cheers.) An attempt had been made to reduce the national expenditure. The reductions in the army and navy, which were considerable reductions, were a grateful relief to the finances of the country, and he believed that they had been achieved without any diminution in the defensive power of those two great fighting services. Abroad they had succeeded in continuing the highly successful policy of their predecessors, whilst we had under the Liberal Government enjoyed a record year of British trade. Their object was not yet finished. There was a good deal of work yet to do in connection with social questions. He was not a Socialist—(a voice, "Hurrah!")—but he said the penalties which fell upon the laggards in our social army should be made less crushing and less severe. Suffering could never be prevented, but it could be minimised. He asked for support for the Government, that they might enter upon the solution of these great problems.—(Cheers.)

ZULUS OR ENGLISH?

THE CHILDREN OF JOHN DUNN.

The Natal Supreme Court has decided that the children of the famous white Zulu chief John Dunn shall be regarded as natives, although exempted from the Native Law.

Mr. Justice Beaumont, in delivering an independent judgment, held that if John Dunn became a Zulu his children were natives, but that if he remained an Englishman his children were illegitimate.

POPE AND FRANCE.

INTERFERENCE WITH HER FOREIGN RELATIONS.

The Paris "Matin" says of Monsignor Montagnini's papers, seized when the Papal Nunciature was raided:—"It is perfectly evident from several written documents that the Holy See interfered almost constantly and in a hostile manner in the foreign relations of the French Republic. The Government is, in particular, in possession of irrefutable proof that the Holy See made urgent representations to the King of Spain to prevent him from paying his visit to the President of the Republic in 1905. All the efforts of the Vatican were directed at the time towards preventing the visit of friendly courtesy which the young Sovereign had decided to pay to France.

"I has also been discovered from these papers that certain French officials have been greatly to blame. One of them, in particular, who held an important post at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is said to have kept up secret relations with the Holy See, of which he will have to give an account when he appears before the Directors of the Foreign Office."

The "Figaro" announces that the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador on Thursday sent to Maître Boyer de Bouillane, representing Monsignor Montagnini, 26 documents and a chest containing the archives of the Papal Nunciature.

Several journals having announced that the Government would allow the contracts for the lease of the churches accepted by several communes to stand, the correspondent of the "Echo de Paris" in Rome says he is in a position to state that no contract of this kind yet exists, but only demands for contracts made by numerous priests and accepted by numerous municipalities. As the declaration made by the French episcopate involves the acceptance of these contracts everywhere or not at all, any which have been accepted will not be concluded in any case.

TORY FUNDS AND TITLES.

MR. BOWLES'S ALLEGATIONS.

Mr. T. Gibson Bowles, acknowledging a request for support and a subscription addressed to him by the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Chelsea Conservative Association, says he has always attached great importance to the Conservative party, but no party can keep its credit when it deserts its principles, nor can any leader retain the support of the candid and convinced men among his followers who entertains proposals inconsistent with those principles. "The effect of such conduct on the part of Mr. Balfour," says Mr. Bowles, "has been to drive out of his Government all men of ability and from his followers all men of conviction, to reduce Conservative members of Parliament from 400 to 158, and for the time being to destroy the Conservative party as an active force in the country." Under present circumstances Mr. Bowles deems it his duty to support and act with the Liberal party. Mr. Bowles proceeds:—

"As to subscriptions, I cannot conceive that the Conservative party can need to appeal for these elsewhere than to Mr. Balfour and to Sir A. Acland Hood, who are in possession and exclusive control of the party fund. That fund is immense. Not many years ago it was over £100,000, but at the last election it must have been far greater, for the contributions to it of certain recent recipients of titles have, if common report is to be believed, varied between £30,000 from a new Knight and £250,000 from a new Peer. It was calculated a year ago that at least £500,000 must have been encashed from various sources by this party fund, and it is impossible so vast a sum can have been expended over the general election."

ST. DAVID'S DAY.

ADDRESS BY MR. O. WILLIAMS, M.P.

Mr. Augustus Lewis presided last evening at the dinner of the Manchester Welsh National Society, held at the Albion Hotel. The guest of the evening was Mr. A. Osmond Williams, M.P. There were present, among others, Dr. W. Owen Jones, Dr. Luckman, Dr. Apthomas, Mr. E. Mason Powell, Mr. Philip Hughes, the Rev. W. Owen, Councillor Howell, Mr. John Davies, Mr. Booth Jones, Mr. L. Lloyd, and Mr. T. D. Jones and Mr. Caradoc Thomas, hon. secretaries.

Mr. T. Lewis proposed the toast of the evening, pointing out that St. David combined in his life both religion and politics in the widest and noblest sense, and that he dared to hope great things of Wales. The Welsh nation was now inspired by the great principles, the great verities, which made David himself great. He tried to battle with heresy, but he imagined David's spirit to-day battled with all his might with the one great heresy which said patriotism was a thing to be despised. The band of his worshippers was ever-increasing.—(Applause.)

Mr. Llew Lloyd, proposing "Wales," said it was gratifying to them that in the last few months Wales had had its great educational facilities extended, and that Wales would have to a certain extent the conduct of the arrangement of her own education, which would be in the charge of a Welshman. A good solid foundation had been laid, and it remained for them to build a good and useful superstructure on that foundation. One of their greatest queries in the Principality, he thought, was to shake off the grip of Puritanism. It had brought them into a foremost position with regard to religion among European nations, but they must see that it was not their master. The need for it had gone, and he feared that though the Welsh nation was sensitive and artistic by temperament, yet poetry and music—to a certain extent—were the only arts they appreciated.—(Hear, hear.)

Mr. Osmond Williams, M.P., responded, and began promingly in English to speak of the advantages of literary culture. As for the Welsh people, they did not love Shakspere the less because they loved Dafydd ap Gwilym more.—(Applause.) Warming with his subject, he lapsed into Welsh, amid much applause. At length, returning to English, he claimed that as Welshmen they had much to be proud of. They were proud of being descended from that great Celtic race of which Matthew Arnold wrote, and of which he said the Welsh were the purest, the most numerous, and therefore the most interesting of its descendants. Pennant, again, spoke of their valour and tenacity of liberty, telling what a splendid fight they made against the Romans, more than once driving back their legions. They had clung to their rocks for many centuries after the Romans had gone, and kept their independence against a nation twelve times their number. When they lost it, they did so mainly through their own divisions, and did so in the most warlike of English kings—Edward I. Mr. Osmond Williams went on to show how greatly since then Wales had influenced England through the Tudor sovereigns, and through her eminent artists, poets, bishops, and others. Looking at the present Ministry, one of the most eminent members was Mr. Lloyd-George.—(Applause.) Among philologists they had Professor Rhys; among poets, Sir Lewis Morris; among painters, Sir Edward Burne-Jones.—(Applause.) There seemed to be a certain dominant element in the lives of small nations like Wales, which larger nations had not, and it was a strong feeling of nationality.—(Hear, hear.) He instanced ancient Greece. With all their national patriotism, Welshmen were also proud of the great Empire of which they formed part. They shared the splendours of England, just as much as if the golden coronet of Llewelyn was on the head of his lineal descendant.—(Applause.)

Afterwards the Rev. William Owen, in a humorous speech, proposed "The city of our adoption." Incidentally he claimed for Welshmen a prominent share in its development, instancing the educational value of the bequest by the founder of Owens College.

Mr. E. Mason Powell, who responded, spoke in hearty appreciation of the generous and broad-minded spirit of the Englishmen among whom they had settled, and who never asked whether a man were Welsh or English, Irish or Scottish. It was thus that Welshmen in this, as in other great communities, had won their way to eminence.—(Applause.)

POLITICAL NEEDS.

LIBERAL FEDERATION AND THE LORDS.

COMMONS' AUTHORITY.

DONCASTER, FRIDAY.

There was such a sound agreement on the principal question brought before the General Committee of the National Liberal Federation in the Guildhall here to-day that the meeting seemed a little tame in comparison with some that were held in the days when the preparation of a Liberal fighting policy caused agitation in the ranks. The quiet was of course upon the surface, for when the President (Mr. A. H. D. Acland) moved the resolution which noted "with extreme satisfaction" the fact that the King's Speech contained a reference to "the serious questions which have arisen from the differences between the House of Lords and the House of Commons" cheering began, which presently marked every pause in Mr. Acland's short but weighty speech. He pointed out that the issue as between the Lords and the country has now become more clearly defined than ever before during the lifetime of the present generation by being brought into the Speech from the Throne. The solution must come through the application of a limit to the Lords' power of veto. "We do not want a referendum," Mr. Acland said. The delegates approved that statement with cheers. "Nor do we want a special programme to bring them into particular forms of activity. The evil of their action has been continuous, and now that we have laid our hands to

POPE AND FRANCE.

INTERFERENCE WITH HER FOREIGN RELATIONS.

The Paris "Matin" says of Monsignor Montagnini's papers, seized when the Papal Nunciature was raided:—"It is perfectly evident from several written documents that the Holy See interfered almost constantly and in a hostile manner in the foreign relations of the French Republic. The Government is, in particular, in possession of irrefutable proof that the Holy See made urgent representations to the King of Spain to prevent him from paying his visit to the President of the Republic in 1905. All the efforts of the Vatican were directed at the time towards preventing the visit of friendly courtesy which the young Sovereign had decided to pay to France.

"I has also been discovered from these papers that certain French officials have been greatly to blame. One of them, in particular, who held an important post at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is said to have kept up secret relations with the Holy See, of which he will have to give an account when he appears before the Directors of the Foreign Office."

The "Figaro" announces that the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador on Thursday sent to Maître Boyer de Bouillane, representing Monsignor Montagnini, 26 documents and a chest containing the archives of the Papal Nunciature.

Several journals having announced that the Government would allow the contracts for the lease of the churches accepted by several communes to stand, the correspondent of the "Echo de Paris" in Rome says he is in a position to state that no contract of this kind yet exists, but only demands for contracts made by numerous priests and accepted by numerous municipalities. As the declaration made by the French episcopate involves the acceptance of these contracts everywhere or not at all, any which have been accepted will not be concluded in any case.